To:		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		PCT		
see form PCT/ISA/220				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)		
				Date of mailing (day/month/year) se	ee form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International application No. PCT/EP2004/011365			International filing date (d 06.10.2004	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 08.10.2003	
	national Patent Class D213/79, A61K3	`	9/00, A61P29/00	and IPC		
• •	icant AXO GROUP LIN	MITED				
1.	This opinion co	ntains indication	ons relating to the follo	owing items:		
	Box No. I	Basis of the op	inion			
	☐ Box No. II	Priority				
	Box No. III	Non-establishn	nent of opinion with rega	ard to novelty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicability	
	☐ Box No. IV	Lack of unity of	invention			
	☑ Box No. V		ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations	, , ,	novelty, inventive step or industrial tement	
	🖾 Box No. VI	Certain docum	ents cited			
	☑ Box No. VII	Certain defects	in the international app	lication		
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application						
2.	2. FURTHER ACTION					
	If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.					
	submit to the IPE	A a written reply date of mailing of	together, where appropriate	priate, with amendme	IPEA, the applicant is invited to ents, before the expiration of three of 22 months from the priority date,	
	For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.					
3.	For further detail	s, see notes to F	Form PCT/ISA/220.			

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-



## 10/574886 IAP9Rec'dPCT/PTO 07 APR 2006

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/011365

	Box N	No. I Basis of the opinion		
1.		regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in nguage in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.		
	la	this opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following anguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).		
2.	. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:			
	a. typ	e of material:		
		a sequence listing		
		table(s) related to the sequence listing		
	b. for	nat of material:		
		in written format		
		in computer readable form		
	c. time	e of filing/furnishing:		
		contained in the international application as filed.		
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.		
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.		
3.	h Co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating theretons been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as ppropriate, were furnished.		

4. Additional comments:

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/011365

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability					
		d invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non cable have not been examined in respect of:			
	the entire international application,				
$\boxtimes$	claims Nos. 8-10				
be	because:				
$\boxtimes$	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 8-10 (method of treatment) relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):				
	see separate sheet				
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):				
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinior could be formed.				
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.				
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Anne C of the Administrative Instructions in that:				
	the written form	□ has not been furnished			
		☐ does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form	☐ has not been furnished			
		☐ does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, denot comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.				
	See separate sheet for further	details			

### Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-13

No: Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-3,5-13

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-7,11-13

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

#### Box No. VI Certain documents cited

Certain published documents (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.10)
 and /or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

#### Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

F---- DOTICA/007 / I----- 0004\

#### Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Claims 8-10 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

#### Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

D1: US-A-5 811 459 (BREAULT ET AL) 22 September 1998 (1998-09-22)

D2: WO 01/19814 A (MERCK FROSST CANADA & CO; LACOMBE, PATRICK; LABELLE, MARC; RUEL, REJEA) 22 March 2001 (2001-03-22)

#### 1. Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT):

1.1 D1 discloses compounds antagonizing the effects of PGE2 at the EP1 receptor. The compounds of D1 do not comprise a cyclohexene moiety.

D2 discloses compounds used in the treatment of prostaglandin mediated diseases. The compounds of D2 do not comprise a cyclohexene moiety.

1.2 Since the compounds of formula (I) are not known from the prior art the subjectmatter of claims 1-13 can be considered novel.

#### 2. Inventive Step (Article 33(3) PCT):

2.1 D1 can be seen as the closest prior art since it discloses structurally close compounds which antagonize the effects of PGE2 at the EP1 receptor.

The compounds of formula (I) structurally differ from the compounds of D1 in the presence of a cyclohexene unit linking a phenyl or pyridyl ring with an aryl or

C

0

m

p

9

heterocyclyl ring. The compounds of D1 in contrast comprise an alkylene linker linking a phenyl ring with an aryl or heteroaryl ring.

In the description is disclosed that the compounds of the present invention are selective for EP1 over EP3 (see p. 45 of the description).

The technical problem then can be seen in providing compounds which are selective for EP1 over EP3.

2.2 The solution suggested by the Applicant are the compounds of formula (I). Such compounds are not obvious from D1 or a combination of D1 and D2.

However, it is doubtful that all compounds embraced by claim 1 solve said technical problem. Claim 1 embraces a huge number of compounds which have not been explored in the description as to their biological activity.

In contrast, all compounds which have been tested according to the description

n

S

Having in mind that in the medicament field small structural changes often give rise to substantial and unexpected changes in activity and that the difference between D1 and the compound of formula (I) is smaller than the difference between the different compounds falling within the definition of formula (I), a generalization of experimental results for compounds with quite different structures does not appear to be justified.

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Separate Sheet) (Sheet 3) (EPO-January 2004)

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/011365

It is therefore doubtful that all alternatives covered by the broad scope of the claims would achieve the desired technical effect.

An inventive step therefore can only be acknowledged for the subject-matter of

a i m

4

C

The subject-matter of claims 1-3 and 5-13 cannot be considered inventive.

- 3. Industrial Applicability (Article 33(4) PCT):
- 3.1 The subject-matter of claims 1-7 and 11-13 is considered to be industrially applicable.

#### Re Item VI

#### Certain documents cited

#### Certain published documents

Application No Patent No

Publication date (day/month/year)

Filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (valid claim)
(day/month/year)

WO03/084917

16/10/03

07/04/03

08/04/02

#### Re Item VII

#### Certain defects in the international application

The last paragraph of p. 45 of the description is considered unnecessary (Rule 9 (iv) PCT).